PEGEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 2 5 2005

# **FERENCE & ASSOCIATES**

409 Broad Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15143
Phone: (412) 741-8400
Fax: (412) 741-9292
Web: www.ferencelaw.com

## **USPTO FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**

To:

Commissioner for Patents

Fax Number:

(571) 273-8300

Date:

November 25, 2005

Pages:

4 pages (including this cover sheet)

#### MESSAGE:

SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR WORD PREDICTION AND SPEECH RECOGNITION Application No. 09/904,147 Examiner T. E. Shortledge Art Unit 2654

Response to Restriction Requirement

JP920000133US1 (590.074)

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS COMMUNICATION IS CONFIDENTIAL, MAY BE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED, MAY CONSTITUTE INSIDE INFORMATION, AND IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE ADDRESSEE. UNAUTHORIZED USE, DISCLOSURE OR COPYING IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED AND MAY BE UNLAWFUL.

IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US ON (412) 741-8400.

Atty. Docket No. JP920000133US1 (590.074)

> RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

NOV 2 5 2005

In re Application of

: Mori et al.

Serial No.

09/904,147

Examiner: T. Shortledge

Filed

: July 11, 2001

Art Unit: 2654

For

: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR WORD

PREDICTION AND SPEECH RECOGNITION

November 25, 2005

### RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

I hereby certify that this correspondence and any documents referred to as enclosed therewith are being transmitted by facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents on facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on November 25, 2005.

> D. Ference III Reg\_No. 33,879

November 25, 2005 Date of Signature

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This is responsive to the Restriction Requirement dated October 26, 2005, for the above-identified application.

The Office has asserted the response filed on August 1, 2005, is not fully responsive to the prior restriction requirement because a provisional election was not

Atty. Docket No. JP920000133US1 (590.074)

made. It is respectfully submitted the outstanding Office Action was issued in error as the August 1, 2005, submission was in fact fully responsive.

11-25-'05 18:03 FROM-

In the August 1, 2005, submission Applicants traversed the restriction requirement because "the groups of claims delineated by the Office can be used together, with the apparatus and system claims used to practice the method claims, and so forth". Applicants also asserted "that even if the restriction requirement is not withdrawn, the Claims of Groups I, II, and III should be examined at the same time under MPEP § 803 as there is no serious burden in searching an examining the claims of the groups in the same application. In this regard, the Office's attention was directed to U.S. Patent No. 6,598,018 which is classed in (and was search in) multiple classes, including the three subclasses identified in the original Restriction Requirement. While the comments made in the August 1, 2005, submission are equally appropriate here, they are merely incorporated by reference in the interests of brevity.

Although Applicants believed (and continue to believe) a restriction requirement is improper, the August 1, 2005, submission also included a provisional election. The Office's attention is directed to the last sentence of the second paragraph on Page 3, which states "In the event the restriction requirement is not withdrawn, Applicants provisional elect the claims of Group I (e.g., Claims 1-6, 8-12, and 14-20)." As such, Applicants assert the August 1, 2005, submission was fully responsive.

Atty. Docket No. JP920000133US1 (590.074)

If there are any further issues in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley D. Ference III Registration No. 33,879

Customer No. 35195
FERENCE & ASSOCIATES
409 Broad Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15143
(412) 741-8400
(412) 741-9292 - Facsimile

**Attorneys for Applicants**